



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,239	09/24/2004	Johannes Johanna Van Herk	NL 020256	1780
24737	7590	06/24/2008	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			HOLMES, REX R	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			3762	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
06/24/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/509,239	VAN HERK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	REX HOLMES	3762	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,4 and 6-16 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-2,4,6-16 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn. This action is made final as it is in response to the amendment to the claims that were filed on 9/10/07 by the applicant in response to the non-final action of 3/9/07. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 4, 7, 11 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Byers et al. (U.S. Pat. 4,969,468 hereinafter "Byers") in view of Booker et al. (U.S. Pub. 2003/0114906 hereinafter "Booker").

Regarding claims 1-2, 4, 7, 11 and 13-16, Byers discloses a electrode array for sensing physiological signals through the skin, made out of a conductive flexible/stretchable material with projections made out of metal that are arranged in a uniform pattern on the surface of the electrode (e.g. Col. 7, ll. 18-25; Col. 10, ll. 22-30; Col. 12, ll. 25-40; Figs. 4-6). Byers further discloses that the electrode body is sandwiched between two insulating layers with the tips of the projections sticking through the layers (e.g. Fig. 4 ("8" & "10") & Col. 6, ll. 38-53) but fails to discloses that

the projections and electrode backing are elastic and are used in combination with a storage and analysis device. However Booker discloses a system for monitoring ecg, evaluating ecg and then stimulating that utilizes elastic electrodes (23) with elastic projections (23) to provide a electrode that can conform to tissue so that it maintains constant contact(Fig. 9, ¶42). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system as taught by Byers, with elastic electrodes and projections as taught by Booker, since such a modification would provide the electrodes and projections with elastic properties for providing the predictable result of elastic electrodes with projections that conform to tissue and maintain constant contact without moving.

4. Regarding claims 8-10 and 16, Byers in view of Booker teaches the claimed invention except for the elastic layer being a conductive rubber and the insulating layers being plastic. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the elastic layer with a conductive rubber and the insulating layer with a plastic, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

5. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Byers in view of Booker as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Ingman (U.S. Pub. 2002/0082668).

6. Regarding claim 12, Byers in view of Booker discloses the claimed invention except for the holes to collect sweat and prevent short circuiting. Ingman teaches that it

is known to use holes in the electrode as set forth in Paragraph 16 to prevent sweat from short circuiting the conducting layer of the electro-patch. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the electrode as taught by Byers in view of Booker, with holes through the electrode as taught by Ingman, since such a modification would provide the predictable result of a electrode with holes to prevent sweat from short circuiting the conducting layer of the electrode. Further it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to put the holes between the projections as the only place to put the holes in the body of the electrode would be in the spaces between the projections.

7. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Byers in view of Booker and further in view of Owen et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,148,233 hereinafter "Owen").

8. Regarding claim 6, Byers in view of Booker teaches a flexible/stretchable material with projections made out of metal as disclosed above, but Byers in view of Booker fails to teach a storage and analysis device that includes wearable elastic belt. Owen teaches that it is known to use a wearable system with pad style electrodes as set forth in e.g. Column 1, lines 56-63 and Column 19, lines 30-35 to provide for monitoring ECG and treating cardiac arrest. Owen further teaches that the system includes a processor, memory and ECG analysis modules (Figs. 15-16). Owen further discloses that device includes a method where an external base station is contacted in response to a predetermined condition being sensed (e.g. Col. 4, ll. 39-56). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify the array as taught by Byers in view of Booker, with the portable cardiac arrest monitor as taught by Owen, since such a modification would provide the predictable result of an array with a cardiac monitor for providing a means to monitor and treat cardiac arrest without having to invasively implant a monitor.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 4, 6-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to REX HOLMES whose telephone number is (571)272-8827. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 571-272-4955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 3762

/George R Evanisko/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3762